BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

1

COMMISSIONERS

3

LEA MÁRQUEZ PETERSON - Chairwoman SANDRA D. KENNEDY JUSTIN OLSON ANNA TOVAR JIM O'CONNOR

5

6 In the matter of:

)DOCKET NO. S-20942A-21-0408

SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION

NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER OF

7

James S. Miller (CRD# 4875515),

8

Biltmore Wealth Advisors, LLC (CRD# 165557), an Arizona limited liability company,

Respondents.

9

10

11

12

13

14

NOTICE:

EACH RESPONDENT HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING

EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER

The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") alleges that Respondents James S. Miller and Biltmore Wealth Advisors, LLC have engaged in acts,

practices, and transactions that constitute violations of the Arizona Investment Management Act,

16 A.R.S. § 44-3101 et seq. ("IM Act").

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24 25

26

JURISDICTION

I.

 The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the IM Act.

II.

RESPONDENTS

- James S. Miller ("Miller") has been a resident of the state of Arizona since at least
 February 1999.
- Since October 1, 2012, Miller has been licensed with the Commission as an investment adviser representative in association with Respondent Biltmore Wealth Advisors, LLC ("BWA").

4.	BWA has been licensed with the Commission as an investment adviser since October
1, 2012.	

5. Miller and BWA may be referred to collectively as "Respondents."

III.

FACTS

- As part of its application for licensure with the Commission as an investment adviser,
 BWA submitted a Form ADV on September 18, 2012.
- 7. In response to Item 11(D)(1) of BWA's Form ADV, Part 1A, which asked whether any state regulatory agency had ever found BWA to have made a false statement or omission, or been dishonest, unfair, or unethical, Miller answered "No" on behalf of BWA.
- 8. In response to Item 11(D)(2) of BWA's Form ADV, Part 1A, which asked whether any state regulatory agency had ever found BWA to have been involved in a violation of investment-related regulations or statutes, Miller answered "No" on behalf of BWA.
- 9. In response to Item 11(D)(4) of BWA's Form ADV, Part 1A, which asked whether, in the prior ten years, any state regulatory agency had entered an order against BWA in connection with an investment-related activity, Miller answered "No" on behalf of BWA.
- As part of his application for licensure with the Commission as an investment adviser representative in association with BWA, Miller submitted a Form U4 on September 28, 2012.
- 11. In response to U4 question 14(D)(1)(a), which asked whether any state regulatory agency had ever found Miller to have made a false statement or omission or been dishonest, unfair or unethical, Miller answered "No."
- 12. In response to U4 question 14(D)(1)(b), which asked whether any state regulatory agency had ever found Miller to have been involved in a violation of investment-related regulations or statutes, Miller answered "No."

	13.	In	respons	e to L	4 ques	tion	14(D)(1)(d),	which	asked	whether	any	state	regulatory
agency	had	ever e	entered	an ord	er agai	nst l	Miller i	n con	nection	with	an invest	ment	t-relate	ed activity
Miller	answ	ered "	No."											

- 14. In response to U4 question 14(D)(2)(b), which asked whether Miller has been subject to any final order of a state securities commission that constitutes a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive conduct, Miller answered "No."
- On November 25, 2015, Respondents entered into an Order to Cease and Desist,
 Order for Administrative Penalties, and Consent to Same ("Consent Order") with the Commission.
- 16. Pursuant to the Consent Order, Respondents admitted to violating A.R.S. § 44-3241(A), the IM Act's antifraud statute, by making untrue statements misleading omissions of material facts, (ii) misrepresenting professional qualifications with the intent that the misrepresentation be relied on, and (iii) engaging in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operate or would operate as a fraud or deceit as defined by R14-6-208(A)(1) & (3).
 - 17. Specifically, Respondents admitted to:
 - Inaccurately listing dates of employment and omitting employers from Miller's work history;
 - Claiming to be an adjunct professor at universities having no formal affiliation with Miller;
 - c) Claiming that Miller's 2012 bankruptcy was a business decision and solely to discharge a "frivolous" lawsuit when substantial personal debt was also discharged in the bankruptcy;
 - Representing that Respondents used a formula for maximizing gains without disclosing the limitations and risks involved; and
 - e) Including testimonials from clients on BWA's website.

- 18. Miller has not filed an amended U4 since the Consent Order was issued, and therefore has never amended his U4 to correct his answers to questions 14(D)(1)(a), 14(D)(1)(b), 14(D)(1)(d), or 14(D)(2)(b).
- 19. BWA has filed three amended Form ADVs since the Consent Order was issued. In each amended Form ADV, Miller caused BWA to falsely answer "No" to Items 11(D)(1), 11(D)(2), or 11(D)(4) of Part 1A.

IV.

REMEDIES PURSUANT TO A.R.S. § 44-3201

(Suspension/Revocation of Investment Adviser and Investment Adviser Representative License)

- 20. Grounds exist to suspend or revoke Miller's license with the Commission as an investment adviser representative because it is in the public interest, and:
- a) Miller violated the IM Act within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(3) by failing to file a supplemental statement showing material changes in the facts contained in his original application for licensure within thirty days within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3159(A)(1); and
- b) Miller failed to file with the Commission any record, report, financial statement or other information required under the IM Act within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(4) by failing to file a supplemental statement showing material changes in the facts contained in his original application for licensure within thirty days within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3159(A)(1).
- 21. Grounds exist to suspend or revoke BWA's license with the Commission as an investment adviser because it is in the public interest; and:
- a) Each amended Form ADV filed by BWA since the Consent Order is inaccurate and misleading within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(1);
- b) BWA violated the IM Act within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(3) by failing to file a supplemental statement showing material changes in the facts contained in its original application for licensure within thirty days within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3159(A)(1); and

	1	•	

5

....

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

22

21

2324

25 26 c) BWA failed to file with the Commission a record or other information required under the IM Act within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(4) by failing to file a supplemental statement showing material changes in the facts contained in its original application for licensure within thirty days within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3159(A)(1).

V.

REQUESTED RELIEF

The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:

- Order the suspension or revocation of Miller's license as an investment adviser representative pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3201;
- Order the suspension or revocation of BWA's license as an investment adviser pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3201;
 - 3. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.

VI.

HEARING OPPORTUNITY

Each Respondent may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3212 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. If a Respondent requests a hearing, the requesting Respondent must also answer this Notice. A request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting Respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's website at http://www.azcc.gov/hearing.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Carolyn D. Buck, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number (602) 542-3931, e-mail cdbuck@azcc.gov. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. Additional information about the administrative action procedure may be found at http://www.azcc.gov/securities/enforcement/procedure.

VII.

ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent requests a hearing, the requesting Respondent must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/hearing.

Additionally, the answering Respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3rd Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Chris Nichols.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering Respondent or Respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering Respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, the Respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the Answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown.

Dated this 29th day of December, 2021.

Wendy Coy Assistant Director of Securitie